arXiv:1511.03121v4 [hep-ph] 21 Jul 2016

Dilaton assisted two-field inflation from no-scale supergravity

Girish Kumar Chakravarty[1], Suratna Das[2], Gaetano Lambiase[3,4] and Subhendra Mohanty[1]
[1] *Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad 380009, India*
[2] *Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur 208016, India*
[3] *Dipartimento di Fisica "E.R. Caianiello" Universitá di Salerno, I-84084 Fisciano (Sa), Italy*
[4] *INFN - Gruppo Collegato di Salerno, Italy*

We present a two-field inflation model where inflaton field has a non-canonical kinetic term due to the presence of a dilaton field. It is a two-parameter generalization of one-parameter Brans-Dicke gravity in the Einstein frame. We show that in such an inflation model the quartic and quadratic inflaton potentials, which are otherwise ruled out by the present Planck-*Keck*/BICEP2 data, yield scalar spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio in accordance with the present data. Such a model yield tensor-to-scalar ratio of the order of 10^{-2} which is within the reach of $B-$mode experiments like *Keck*/BICEP3, CMBPol and thus can be put to test in the near future. This model yields negligible non-Gaussianity and no isocurvature perturbations upto slow-roll approximation. Finally, we show that such a model can be realised in the realm of no-scale supergravity.

I. INTRODUCTION

Inflation [1], a rapid accelerated expanding phase of the universe in its very early stage of evolution, provides a mechanism of generation of tiny density fluctuations over the homogeneous and isotropic background, which later evolve into large scale structures like galaxies and clusters of galaxies in the universe. It also explains the observed nearly scale invariant spectrum of these density fluctuations on superhorizon scales. Parameters, like scalar amplitude, scalar spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio, predicted by inflationary paradigm are being very accurately determined by the high-precision CMBR observations, like WMAP and Planck. The recent Planck-2015 data predicts the scalar amplitude and the scalar spectral index as $10^{10}\ln(\Delta^2_{\mathcal{R}}) = 3.089 \pm 0.036$ and $n_s = 0.9666 \pm 0.0062$ respectively at (68% CL, PlanckTT+lowP) [2, 3]. Recently BICEP2/Keck Array CMB polarization experiments combined with Planck analysis of CMB polarization and temperature data have put a bound on tensor-to-scalar ratio as $r_{0.05} < 0.07$ (95% CL) [4, 5]. Planck also confirms that the primordial perturbations, to a good approximation, are indeed Gaussian in nature by constraining the primordial Non-Gaussianity (NG) amplitude as $f_{\rm NL} \sim 0$ [6].

There is a plethora of inflationary models which explain the key inflationary parameters like scalar amplitude, scalar spectral index and tensor-to-scalar ratio as observed in the CMB measurements and also account for the smallness of the non-Gaussianity parameter simultaneously. But it is well known that the simplest single field slow-roll inflation models with quartic $\lambda\phi^4$ and quadratic $m^2_\phi\phi^2$ potentials are ruled out from the observations as they produce large tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \simeq 0.26$ and $r \simeq 0.13$, respectively, for 60 e-foldings [2]. One novel way of making the quartic potential of inflaton viable is through what is now known as the Higgs inflation scenario [7], where the inflaton field ϕ is non-minimally coupled to the curvature scalar R (coupling term looks like $\xi\phi^2 R$). This gives rise to very small tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \sim 0.003$ for $N \approx 60$. Such a model however encounters the problem of unitarity violation in Higgs-Higgs scattering via graviton exchange at Planck energy scales because of very large curvature coupling $\xi \sim 10^4$ required to obtain the observed CMB amplitude [8]. Starobinsky model of inflation which is R^2 correction to Einstein gravity is mathematically equivalent to Higgs inflation model with quartic potential and therefore it produces the similar small tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \sim 0.003$ [9]. On the other hand, generalized non-minimally coupled models with coupling term $\xi\phi^a R^b$ and quantum corrected quartic potential $\lambda\phi^{4(1+\gamma)}$, which are equivalent to power law inflation model $R+R^\beta$, are studied in [10] which produce large $r \sim 0.2$, and thus are disfavored by present status of the CMB data [4]. In the context of upcoming experiments like Keck/BICEP3 and CMBPol, it would be of interest to come up with models which predict r close to the current bound of $r < 0.07$. From the theoretical perspective it would be desirable to examine scenarios where the $\lambda\phi^4$ or $m^2_\phi\phi^2$ potentials, which generically occur in particle physics, are compatible with CMB observations.

In this work we study a two-field inflationary model where the inflaton field ϕ is assisted by a dilaton field σ and has a non-canonical kinetic term due to the presence of a dilaton field. Supergravity theories which are low energy limit of string theory contains several scalar fields which can be of cosmological interest. The action of the model can be generically written as

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[R - \nabla^\mu\sigma\nabla_\mu\sigma - e^{-\gamma\sigma}\nabla^\mu\phi\nabla_\mu\phi - 2e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi)\right], \quad (1)$$

where β and γ are arbitrary independent parameters. Brans-Dicke (BD) gravity in Einstein frame (EF) is a special case where $\beta = 2\gamma$ [11–15]. However BD gravity predicts r larger than the observed limit, therefore generalization of BD theory is necessary for application to inflation. In this paper we generalize the BD theory in EF to a two-parameter scalar-tensor theory where we treat

β and γ as two independent arbitrary parameters. Addition of one extra parameter allows us to obtain viable inflation with otherwise ruled out quadratic and quartic potentials as we can have tensor-to-scalar ratio r in the range of interest for forthcoming experiments.

To note, it was shown by Ellis et al. [16] that the inflaton field accompanied by a moduli field T, which appear in string theories and have a no-scale supergravity form, give a potential for inflation equivalent to the $R + R^2$ Starobinsky model, producing $r \sim 10^{-3}$. We show in this paper that the above mentioned two parameter scalar-tensor theory can be obtained from no-scale supergravity theories [17–19] which now can produce r much larger than 10^{-3} and thus are observationally falsifiable by future experiments. Also in contrast to the supergravity embedding of the Starobinsky model, studied in [20, 21], where the imaginary part of the superfield T (*i.e.* axion ϕ) decreases rapidly and its real part (*i.e.* dilaton σ) drives the inflation, we will see that in our model dilaton-axion pair evolves sufficiently during inflation and the axion acts as the inflaton.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL

First we look at the background dynamics of our model. Starting from the action (1), the equations of motion of the fields ϕ and σ and the Friedmann equations can be obtained as

$$\ddot{\sigma} + 3H\dot{\sigma} + \frac{\gamma}{2}e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2 - \beta e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi) = 0, \tag{2}$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} - \gamma\dot{\sigma}\dot{\phi} + e^{(\gamma-\beta)\sigma}V'(\phi) = 0, \tag{3}$$

$$3H^2 = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\sigma}^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2 + e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi), \tag{4}$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\dot{\sigma}^2 + e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2\right), \tag{5}$$

where an over dot represents derivatives w.r.t. time and prime denotes derivative with respect to ϕ. In the slow-roll regime when both the fields slow-roll, terms with double time derivatives can be neglected and therefore the background equations reduce to

$$3H\dot{\sigma} = \beta e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi), \qquad 3H\dot{\phi} = -e^{(\gamma-\beta)\sigma}V'(\phi), \tag{6}$$

$$3H^2 = e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi), \qquad \dot{H} = -\frac{\dot{\sigma}^2 + e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2}{2}. \tag{7}$$

Here the full potential $W(\sigma, \phi) \equiv e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi)$ can be regarded as the product of potentials of the individual fields, $U(\sigma) \equiv e^{-\beta\sigma}$ and $V(\phi)$, and thus we define the slow-roll parameters for both the fields in a usual way (following [13]) :

$$\epsilon_\phi \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{V'(\phi)}{V(\phi)}\right)^2, \qquad \eta_\phi \equiv \frac{V''(\phi)}{V(\phi)},$$
$$\epsilon_\sigma \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{U_\sigma}{U}\right)^2 = \frac{\beta^2}{2}, \qquad \eta_\sigma \equiv \frac{U_{\sigma\sigma}}{U} = \beta^2, \tag{8}$$

where $U_\sigma \equiv \partial U/\partial\sigma$. To ensure the smallness of the slow-roll parameters we demand that the Hubble slow-roll parameter $\epsilon_H \equiv -\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} \ll 1$ during inflation. We notice that

$$\epsilon_H = \epsilon_\sigma + e^{\gamma\sigma}\epsilon_\phi, \tag{9}$$

which implies that $\epsilon_\sigma \ll 1$ and $e^{\gamma\sigma}\epsilon_\phi \ll 1$ during inflation. Again, taking a time-derivative of the second equation of (6) to obtain $\dot{H}$, one obtains $\epsilon_H = \frac{\ddot{\phi}}{H\dot{\phi}} + e^{\gamma\sigma}\eta_\phi - (\gamma - \beta)\beta$, which implies that $e^{\gamma\sigma}\eta_\phi \ll 1$ and $\gamma \ll \beta + \frac{1}{\beta} \sim \frac{1}{\beta}$ (as β is to be taken smaller than unity). We would show later on that the dilaton field σ evolve slower than the inflaton field ϕ throughout the inflationary phase which would enable us to treat σ as a background field.

Furthermore, we would require the initial field values to calculate the inflationary observables such as n_s, r and $f_{\rm NL}$. From the first equation of (7), we notice that

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 + \beta \ln\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right), \tag{10}$$

$$\int d\phi \frac{V(\phi)}{V'(\phi)} = -\frac{e^{\gamma\sigma_0}}{\beta\gamma}\left[\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^{\beta\gamma} - 1\right], \tag{11}$$

where subscript 0 indicates the values of the quantities 60 e-foldings prior to end of inflation. Defining $f(\phi) \equiv \int d\phi \frac{V(\phi)}{V'(\phi)}$ and requiring $\frac{a_f}{a_0} \gtrsim e^{\Delta N}$ (subscript f denoting the quantities at the end of inflation) for sufficient inflation, one gets

$$\frac{1}{\beta\gamma}\ln\left[1 + \beta\gamma e^{-\gamma\sigma_0}(f(\phi_0) - f(\phi_f))\right] \gtrsim \Delta N. \tag{12}$$

The perturbation analysis of such a model has been extensively discussed in [12–14], where the comoving curvature perturbation is defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \Phi - \frac{H}{\dot{H}}\left(\dot{\Phi} + H\Phi\right) = \Phi + H\frac{\dot{\sigma}\delta\sigma + e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}\delta\phi}{\dot{\sigma}^2 + e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2}, \tag{13}$$

where Φ is the scalar metric perturbation in the longitudinal gauge. As we are dealing with a multi-field inflationay model, $\mathcal{R}$ is not a frozen quantity on superhorizon scales and its time evolution is given by

$$\dot{\mathcal{R}} = \frac{k^2}{a^2}\frac{H^2}{\dot{H}}\Phi + \mathcal{S}, \tag{14}$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ represents isocurvature (or entropy) perturbations given by

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{2H(\beta\dot{\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2V(\phi)e^{-\gamma\sigma} + \dot{\phi}\dot{\sigma}^2V'(\phi))}{e^{\beta\sigma}(\dot{\sigma}^2 + e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot{\phi}^2)^2}\left(\frac{\delta\sigma}{\dot{\sigma}} - \frac{\delta\phi}{\dot{\phi}}\right). \tag{15}$$

Under slow-roll approximation, one can solve for the scalar perturbations of the model, $\delta\sigma$, $\delta\phi$ and Φ, on superhorizon scales, which turn out to be [12]

$$\frac{\delta\sigma}{\dot{\sigma}} = \frac{c_1}{H} - \frac{c_3}{H}, \qquad \frac{\delta\phi}{\dot{\phi}} = \frac{c_1}{H} + \frac{c_3}{H}\left(e^{-\gamma\sigma} - 1\right), \tag{16}$$

$$\Phi = -c_1\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} + c_3\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{V'(\phi)}{V(\phi)}\right)^2(1 - e^{\gamma\sigma}) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}\right], \tag{17}$$

where c_1 and c_3 are the time independent integration constants and can be fixed using initial conditions. In the above expression (17), terms proportional to c_1 represent the adiabatic modes while those proportional to c_3 represent the isocurvature modes. Using eq.s (6)-(8), the comoving curvature perturbation (13) can be simplified to the form: $\mathcal{R} \simeq \Phi + c_1 - c_3 + c_3\epsilon_\phi(\epsilon_\sigma + e^{\gamma\sigma}\epsilon_\phi)$.

Since from eq.(17), it is clear that all the terms in Φ are proportional to $(c_1, c_3)\times$ slow-roll parameters, therefore we will ignore the potential Φ compared to c_1 and c_3 in $\mathcal{R}$. From eq. (16), we can calculate c_1 and c_3. Substituting c_1 and c_3, the comoving curvature perturbation on super horizon scales becomes

$$\mathcal{R} = H\frac{\delta\phi}{\dot\phi}e^{\gamma\sigma}A + H\frac{\delta\sigma}{\dot\sigma}B, \tag{18}$$

where $A = \epsilon_\phi/\epsilon_H$ and $B = \epsilon_\sigma/\epsilon_H$.

Now we look at the observables predicted by this model. The mode functions for superhorizon fluctuations of σ and ϕ, evaluated at horizon crossing $k = a(t_k)H(t_k)$, are $\langle|\delta\sigma(k)|^2\rangle = H^2(t_k)/2k^3$ and $\langle|\delta\phi(k)|^2\rangle = e^{\gamma\sigma(t_k)}H^2(t_k)/2k^3$. Therefore, the power spectrum of comoving curvature perturbations becomes

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R} \equiv \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2}\langle\mathcal{R}^2\rangle = \frac{H^2}{8\pi^2\epsilon_H}. \tag{19}$$

The tensor power spectrum retains its generic form, because the action involves only minimal Einstein curvature term R, given by $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{T} = 8H^2(t_k)/4\pi^2$, which yields the tensor-to-scalar ratio as

$$r \equiv \frac{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{T}}{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R}} = 16\epsilon_H. \tag{20}$$

The scalar spectral index n_s in this model is

$$n_s - 1 \simeq A\left[(2\eta_\phi - 6\epsilon_\phi)e^{2\gamma\sigma} - \beta(2\beta+\gamma)e^{\gamma\sigma}\right] - B\beta^2. \tag{21}$$

It can be noted that in the limit $\beta \to 0$ and $\gamma \to 0$ (i.e. $A = 1$ and $B = 0$) the forms of power spectrum, tensor-to-scalar ratio and spectral index reduce to their standard forms in the single field slow-roll inflation.

It is important to note that in our model the amplitude of the isocurvature perturbations,

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{S} = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2}\langle\mathcal{S}^2\rangle = \frac{H^4}{\pi^2}\frac{\left[\beta e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot\phi V(\phi) + \dot\sigma V'(\phi)\right]^2}{e^{(2\beta-\gamma)\sigma}(\dot\sigma^2 + e^{-\gamma\sigma}\dot\phi^2)^3}, \tag{22}$$

vanishes in the slow-roll approximation (using (6)). The multifield models with non-canonical kinetic term posses a strong single-field attractor solution [22, 23] as has also been observed in this case. But generally these multifield models produce isocurvature perturbations which can also account for a large angular scale suppression of the power spectrum. But our case differs from such multifield models as it does not produce any isocurvature perturbations upto slow-roll approximation.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE MODEL

In our model, we would treat the ϕ field as the inflaton field which is assisted by the dilaton field σ during the inflationary evolution. This can only be ensured if we confirm that the σ field evolves slower than the ϕ field during the entire inflationary epoch. To show this, we first study the background evolution of both the scalar fields ϕ and σ by numerically solving the field eq.s (2-5). We first treat the case when the inflaton field has quadratic potential $V(\phi) = m_\phi^2\phi^2/2$. As some representative initial conditions, we choose $\sigma_0 = 0.1$ and $\phi_0 = 45$ (Solid), $\phi_0 = 38$ (Dotted), $\phi_0 = 32$ (Dashed) corresponding to $\beta = 0.04$, $\beta = 0.035$, $\beta = 0.03$ respectively. Also we fix $\gamma = 2\sqrt{2/3}$ for each case, which is required for the SUGRA derivation of this model studied in the later part of this paper. The initial conditions are chosen carefully such that we get correct n_s and r for $\Delta N \simeq 60$ e-folds. In FIG. 1, we show the time evolution of the fields ϕ and σ where time is given in the units of m_ϕ^{-1}. The different colors in the figure correspond to different initial conditions as described above. In FIG. 2 (upper panel) shows the evolution of the fields in (σ, ϕ) plane. This plot shows that during 60-efolds inflation, dilaton σ evolves much slower compared to inflaton ϕ. After the end of infla-



FIG. 1. Evolution of the scalar fields w.r.t. time t measured in the units of m_ϕ^{-1} is shown.



FIG. 2. *Upper panel :* Evolution of the inflaton $\phi(t)$ with respect to dilaton $\sigma(t)$ is shown. Bigger black dots correspond to the field values when inflation starts and smaller dots correspond to the field values at the end of inflation. We see that during inflation the evolution of dilaton is much slower compared to inflaton. *Lower panel :* The cosmological evolution of the scale factor is shown. The straight dot-dashed line represent the $\Delta N = 60$ line where inflation ends.



FIG. 3. The $n_s - r$ predictions of the model for quadratic (upper panel) and quartic (lower panel) potentials are shown with various contour lines and compared with 1σ and 2σ contours of the Planck observations [5]. We take $\Delta N = 60$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.1$. In both the figures the range of values of γ increases along the curves from top to bottom. It is also manifest that as the values of β and γ goes to zero, n_s and r values converges to standard slow-roll inflation predictions.

tion, inflaton goes to its minimum value $\phi = 0$. Such background evolution of the fields also ensure that the background spatial metric evolves (quasi-)exponentially during inflation which has been depicted in the lower panel of FIG. 2. Also we checked that for the case of quartic potential $V(\phi) = \lambda\phi^4/4$, the fields evolve in a similar way ensuring that ϕ can be treated as an inflaton field.

We now analyze the observable parameters for inflaton potential $V(\phi) = \lambda_n\phi^n/n$. From eq. (11), we find $\sigma_f = \sigma_0 + \beta\Delta N$. Using $\epsilon_H = 1$, which is the condition for the end of inflation, we obtain $\phi_f = ne^{\gamma\sigma_f/2}/\sqrt{2-\beta^2}$. From eq.(12), the field value ϕ_0 can be expressed in terms of ϕ_f and σ_0 as $\phi_0^2 \simeq \phi_f^2 + \frac{2n}{\beta\gamma}e^{\gamma\sigma_0}\left(e^{\beta\gamma\Delta N} - 1\right)$. Now we substitute ϕ_0 into eq.s (19), (20) and (21) to give n_s, r and $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{R}$ in terms of σ_0, n, ΔN, β and γ. For $\Delta N = 60$ e-folds and for the choice $\sigma_0 = 0.1$ with various choices of the parameters β and γ, the $n_s - r$ predictions for quadratic ($n = 2$) and quartic ($n = 4$) potentials are shown in the FIG. 3. For $\sigma_0 = 0.1$, $\Delta N = 60$ and for the range of the parameter values of (β, γ) as shown in

FIG. 3, we find inflaton mass in the range $\lambda_2 = m_\phi^2 \sim 10^{-11} - 10^{-14}$ and self-coupling in the range $\lambda_4 = \lambda \sim 10^{-13} - 10^{-17}$. E.g. for the choice $\beta = 0.05$, $\gamma = 0.7$, which can produce $n_s \simeq 0.9666$, $r \simeq 0.06$, gives $m_\phi \approx 2 \times 10^{-6}$. And for $\beta = 0.06$, $\gamma = 1$, which produces $n_s \simeq 0.964$, $r \simeq 0.05$, gives $\lambda \approx 10^{-16}$. Therefore, in this model with quadratic and quartic potentials, similar to the case of single-field slow-roll inflation, we require light inflaton mass and fine-tuning of the inflaton self-coupling in order to fit the observed CMB amplitude. However, unlike the Higgs inflation which predicts very small $r \approx 0.003$ and standard single-field inlation with quadratic and quartic potentials give large r, the two field model can give r close to the present bound $r < 0.07$. For the above mentioned initial conditions, coupling constants and parameter values, the running of the spectral index $\alpha_s \equiv \frac{dn_s}{d\ln k} \simeq \frac{1}{H}\frac{dn_s}{dt}$ comes out to be $\alpha_s \simeq -6.7\times10^{-4}$ and $\alpha_s \simeq -1.2 \times 10^{-3}$ for quadratic and quartic potentials, respectively, fully consistant with the Planck observation $\alpha_s = 0.0084 \pm 0.0082$ $(68\%CL, PlanckTT + lowP)$ [2].

Besides yielding r, n_s and α_s within the observational bounds, a viable inflationary model should not produce large Non-Gaussianity (NG) to remain in accordance with observations. NG in multifield models where the fields have non-canonical kinetic terms has been calculated in Ref.s [24, 25]. Following these Ref.s, we calculated the non-linearity parameter f_{NL} which characterizes the amplitude of NG. We find that for the range of parameters values as shown in FIG. 1, $f_{\rm NL} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2}) - \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ consistent with the observations. Also we find that $f_{\rm NL}$ does not depend on initial value of the dilaton σ_0 and coupling constants for the considered chaotic form of potential.

IV. NO-SCALE SUGRA REALISATION OF THE MODEL

In this section we would show that, such a two-field inflationary model can be realised in the realm of no-scale Supergravity. The two-field models of inflation with string motivated tree-level no-scale Kähler potential in no-scale supergravity framework are analyzed in [26–29]. The F-term scalar potential in EF is determined from Kähler function given in terms of Kähler potential $K(\phi_i, \phi_i^*)$ and superpotential $W(\phi_i)$ as $G \equiv K + \ln W + \ln W^*$, where ϕ_i are the chiral superfields. In the supergravity action, potential and kinetic terms in EF are given by

$$V = e^G \left[\frac{\partial G}{\partial \phi^i} K^i_{j*} \frac{\partial G}{\partial \phi^*_j} - 3\right], \qquad \mathcal{L}_K = K^{j*}_i \partial_\mu \phi^i \partial^\mu \phi^*_j, \tag{23}$$

where K^i_{j*} is the inverse of the Kähler metric $K^{j*}_i \equiv \partial^2 K/\partial\phi^i \partial\phi^*_j$. We consider the Kähler potential of the following form

$$K = -3\ln[T + T^*] + \frac{b\rho\rho^*}{(T+T^*)^\omega}, \tag{24}$$

here T is the two component chiral superfield whose real part is the dilaton and imaginary part is an axion. We identify axion as the inflaton of the model, and ρ is an additional matter field with modular weight ω. In typical orbifold string compactifications with three moduli fields, the modular weight ω has value 3 [26, 27, 30]. Here we shall treat ω as a phenomenological parameter whose value can have small deviation from the canonical value 3 which may be explained via string loop corrections to the effective supergravity action [31]. In this model to obtain the correct CMB observables, the parameter $(3-\omega)$ has to be fine tuned to the order of 10^{-2}.



FIG. 4. Inflationary evolution of the potential $V(\rho)$ is shown for the three initial condition as discussed before. We see that during inflation the potential for the field ρ is exponential steep and therefore the field ρ rapidly falls towards the minima of the potential and stabilizes at $\rho = 0$.

For the complete specification of supergravity, we assume the superpotential as $W = \lambda_m\ \rho\ T^m$. We can decompose T field in its real and imaginary parts parametrized by two real fields σ and ϕ, respectively, as $T = e^{-\sqrt{2/3}\sigma} + i\sqrt{2/3}\phi$.

The evolution of the matter field ρ is constrained by the exponential factor e^K via e^G in the scalar potential (23) as $V \propto e^{\frac{b\rho\rho^*}{(T+T^*)^\omega}}$. Since $(T+T^*)^{-\omega} = 2e^{\frac{2}{3}\omega\sigma} \gtrsim 2$ for $\omega \approx 3$ and $\sigma > 0$ during inflation. Therefore field ρ, due to its exponentially steep potential, is rapidly driven to zero at the start of the inflation and stabilizes at $\rho = 0$ [28]. In FIG. 4, we show the stabilization of the field ρ for different initial conditions as discussed before for $(2m = n = 2)$. We also checked the evolution of ρ for $(2m = n = 4)$ and found that it stabilizes in the similar fashion. Therefore for vanishing ρ, the scalar potential and kinetic term (23) takes the simple form

$$V = \frac{\lambda_m^2 T^m T^{*m}}{b(T+T^*)^{3-\omega}}, \qquad \mathcal{L}_K = \frac{3\partial^\mu T \partial_\mu T^*}{(T+T^*)^2}, \tag{25}$$



FIG. 5. The $n_s - r$ predictions for quadratic ($n = 2$) and quartic ($n = 4$) potentials with a fixed value of $\gamma = 2\sqrt{2/3}$ are shown and compared with 1σ and 2σ contours of the Planck observations [5]. The range of values of β increases along the curves from top to bottom.

which upon using the decomposition of T becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_K = \frac{1}{2}\partial^\mu\sigma\partial_\mu\sigma + \frac{1}{2}e^{-\gamma\sigma}\partial^\mu\phi\partial_\mu\phi, \tag{26}$$

$$V = \frac{2^{\omega-3}\lambda_m^2}{b}\; e^{-\beta\sigma}\left[e^{\gamma\sigma} + \frac{2}{3}\phi^2\right]^m, \tag{27}$$

where $\gamma = 2\sqrt{2/3} \simeq 1.633$ and $\beta = (3-\omega)\sqrt{2/3}$. Since during inflation, dilaton σ evolves much slower compared to inflaton ϕ, see FIG. 2, therefore $e^{\gamma\sigma} \ll \phi^2$ and hence the first term inside the bracket in (27) can be neglected compared to second term.

Therefore, from (26) and (27), the Lagrangian in EF becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_M = \frac{1}{2}\partial^\mu\sigma\partial_\mu\sigma + \frac{1}{2}e^{-\gamma\sigma}\partial^\mu\phi\partial_\mu\phi + e^{-\beta\sigma}V(\phi), \tag{28}$$

where $V(\phi) = \lambda_m^2\phi^{2m}/2m$ and we set $b = 2^\omega/6$ for quadratic potential ($2m = n = 2$) and $b = 2\times 2^\omega/9$ for quartic potential ($2m = n = 4$). We see that the parameter b is no new parameter and can be given in terms of ω. For $\Delta N = 60$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.1$, the $n_s - r$ predictions for a fixed value of $\gamma = 2\sqrt{2/3}$ and with varying β are shown in FIG. 5.

V. CONCLUSION

To summarize, our two-field two-parameter inflationary model, where the inflaton field has a non-canonical kinetic term due to the presence of the dilaton field, renders quartic and quadratic potentials of the inflaton field viable with current observations. Unlike Higgs-inflationary scenario which predicts very small tensor-to-scalar ratio $r \approx 0.003$, this model can produce large r in the range $r \sim 10^{-1} - 10^{-2}$ which would definitely be probed by future $B-$mode experiments and thus such a model can be put to test with the future observations. Also this model produces no isocurvature perturbations upto slow-roll approximation and predicts negligible non-Gaussianity consistent with the observations. In addition, we showed that this model can be obtained from a no-scale SUGRA model which makes this model of inflation phenomenologically interesting from the particle physics perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Work of SD is supported by Department of Science and Technology, Government of India under the Grant Agreement number IFA13-PH-77 (INSPIRE Faculty Award). We thank the anonymous referees for their critical comments which improved the discussion of the model.

[1] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 347 (1981); A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **108**, 389 (1982);
[2] P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO].
[3] P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].
[4] P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, arXiv:submit/1390175 [astro-ph.CO].
[5] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].
[6] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1502.01592 [astro-ph.CO].
[7] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 703 (2008).
[8] G. F. Giudice and H. M. Lee, Phys. Lett. B **694**, 294 (2011).
[9] A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **30**, 682 (1979) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **30**, 719 (1979)]; Phys. Lett. B **91**, 99 (1980).
[10] G. Chakravarty, S. Mohanty and N. K. Singh, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **23**, no. 4, 1450029 (2014); J. Joergensen, F. Sannino and O. Svendsen, arXiv:1403.3289 [hep-ph]; A. Codello, J. Joergensen, F. Sannino and O. Svendsen, arXiv:1404.3558 [hep-ph]; G. K. Chakravarty and S. Mohanty, Phys. Lett. B **746**, 242 (2015).
[11] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).
[12] A. A. Starobinsky and J. Yokoyama, gr-qc/9502002.
[13] J. Garcia-Bellido and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6739 (1995).

[14] F. Di Marco, F. Finelli and R. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 063512 (2003).

[15] Y. g. Gong, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 083507 (1999).

[16] J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. A. Olive, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** (2013) 111301 [Erratum-ibid. **111** (2013) 12, 129902] [arXiv:1305.1247 [hep-th]].

[17] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **133**, 61 (1983).

[18] J. R. Ellis, A. B. Lahanas, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. B **134**, 429 (1984).

[19] A. B. Lahanas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rept. **145**, 1 (1987).

[20] R. Kallosh, A. Linde, B. Vercnocke and W. Chemissany, JCAP **1407**, 053 (2014) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2014/07/053 [arXiv:1403.7189 [hep-th]].

[21] K. Hamaguchi, T. Moroi and T. Terada, Phys. Lett. B **733**, 305 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.05.006 [arXiv:1403.7521 [hep-ph]].

[22] D. I. Kaiser and E. I. Sfakianakis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, no. 1, 011302 (2014).

[23] K. Schutz, E. I. Sfakianakis and D. I. Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 6, 064044 (2014).

[24] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, JCAP **0509**, 011 (2005) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2005/09/011 [astro-ph/0506056].

[25] K. Y. Choi, L. M. H. Hall and C. van de Bruck, JCAP **0702**, 029 (2007) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2007/02/029 [astro-ph/0701247].

[26] J. A. Casas, In *Jerusalem 1997, High energy physics* 914-917 [hep-ph/9802210].

[27] J. Ellis, M. A. G. Garcia, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. A. Olive, JCAP **1408**, 044 (2014).

[28] J. Ellis, M. A. G. Garca, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. A. Olive, JCAP **1501**, no. 01, 010 (2015).

[29] S. Ferrara, A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, Fortsch. Phys. **62**, 573 (2014).

[30] L. J. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Nucl. Phys. B **329**, 27 (1990).

[31] J. P. Derendinger, S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B **372**, 145 (1992).